

1
2
3
4
5
6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**
8

9 Robert Angel Ramirez,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 Corizon Health, et al.,

13 Defendants.
14

No. CV-18-00004-PHX-DWL

ORDER

15 Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of the United
16 States Magistrate Judge (Doc. 73). The R&R, which was issued on January 30, 2020,
17 recommends “that the Court dismiss without prejudice Defendant Brisbois from Plaintiff’s
18 Complaint (Doc. 1) for failure to serve pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m).” (Doc. 73 at 3.)
19 The R&R further states that “[t]he parties shall have fourteen days from the date of service
20 of a copy of this recommendation within which to file specific written objections with the
21 Court.” (*Id.*)

22 Here, no such objections have been filed. Thus, the Court accepts the Magistrate
23 Judge’s recommendation. *See, e.g., Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149-50 (1985) (“It does
24 not appear that Congress intended to require district court review of a magistrate’s factual
25 or legal conclusions, under a *de novo* or any other standard, when neither party objects to
26 those findings.”); *Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003) (“[N]o
27 review is required of a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation unless objections are
28 filed.”). *See also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003)


1 (“[T]he district judge must review the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations
2 de novo *if objection is made*, but not otherwise.”).

3 Accordingly,

4 **IT IS ORDERED** that the R&R’s recommended disposition (Doc. 73) is **accepted**.

5 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendant Brisbois is **dismissed** from this
6 action, the dismissal being without prejudice.

7 Dated this 27th day of February, 2020.

8
9
10 
11 _____
12 Dominic W. Lanza
13 United States District Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28